Virginia M. Barry, Ph.D.
Commissioner of Education
Tel. 603-271-3144

Paul K. Leather
Deputy Commissioner
Tel. 603-271-3801

New Hampshire Task Force on **EFFECTIVE TEACHING** PHASE II

◆ AGENDA ◆
Second Meeting
October 25, 2011
Londergan Hall ◆ Room 15

4:00 Welcome & updates
- ✓ Review reading material and plan for the meeting
- ✓ Contextualize plan for the meeting in terms of the longer term work plan for Phase II

4:15 Phase I Report: Issues and Questions for Phase II
- ✓ In **four groups**, review the "issues and questions for Phase II" from the four Phase I subcommittees. Knowing that most of these issues are important, please prioritize each question as follows (you will need to work very quickly). Please appoint a facilitator and recorder.
    - o <u>Immediate Priority</u>: Phase II Task Force must address this question this year, prior to piloting educator effectiveness systems
    - o <u>Secondary Priority</u>: Phase II TF must address this question before educator effectiveness systems are operational, but <u>not</u> before they are piloted
    - o <u>Long Term Priority</u>: Phase II TF should address this question in the long term, but it is not as high a priority for this Task Force
    - o <u>Probably no longer important</u>: Phase II TF does not have to address this question in the foreseeable future.

✓ Please provide a short rationale/explanation for your prioritization. Use the attached tables (Appendix A) to help you keep track of you notes and comments.

5:00 Report Out on Phase I "Issues and Questions" for Phase II

5:30 Foundational Questions for Phase II
✓ In four groups, try to address—as specifically as possible—the following questions/considerations. Please appoint a facilitator and recorder.

Policy group
1. What should be the role of the State in defining educator evaluation systems in NH?
   a. Should the same components be required in all schools for all similarly defined educators?
   b. Should districts/schools be able to design their own systems?
      i. If so, should these local systems be required to follow a "state framework?"
      ii. Should these local systems be subject to state review and what criteria should be used for the evaluations?
      iii. Who should do such reviews?
2. What will be done with the results of the evaluations? Will educators be dismissed, provided with raises/bonuses, targeted for improvement, etc?
   a. Who should make these decisions?

Support/Improvement
1. What type of information about their performance (or their students' performance) would teachers need to be able to improve their own practice?
   a. How often and in what form would they need this information?
2. What type of information would school leaders need in order to improve the practices of individual teachers? Groups of teachers?
   a. How often and in what form would they need this information?
3. What type of information would leaders need to be able to improve their own practice?
   a. How often and in what form would they need this information?
4. Should all of these types and forms of information "count" in educator evaluation? If not, which one should count?

Operationalizing and Measuring Indicators
1. Describe the types of evidence—not how you would collect the evidence—that you would need to see to convince you that the teacher/leader possessed the particular knowledge and skills described for the "*Instructional Practice*" domain of an effective teacher (see page 8 of the Phase I report). Please be as specific as possible such that the descriptions can lead to measureable indicators. Note: this will be very challenging.
2. Once the evidence statement has been clearly explicated, try as specifically as possible to describe ways that you would gather information to contribute to the evidence described in #1. Please try to describe as many sources of information as possible as well as the rationale for using each approach. For example, you might indicate that content tests and/or teacher interviews would be useful approaches for providing evidence about

teachers' content knowledge and provide a rationale why each of these could provide useful information.
3. After completing 1 & 2, conduct a crosswalk between the evidence statements and the Danielson framework to honestly indicate which aspects of the evidence statements are covered by the Danielson framework and which one are not covered by Danielson. [Note: I am not sure we will have time for this.]

"Student growth"
1. What should be the role of standardized test scores (e.g., NECAP, NWEA) in educator evaluation?
2. What sort of evidence of student achievement should schools use in educator evaluations for those educators responsible for non-tested subjects and grades?
3. Campbell's Law and other corrupting influences are at play in most accountability systems, but will undoubtedly play a bigger in educator evaluation systems than in school accountability systems. Yet, trying to maximize security could have a negative effect on usefulness. What might be some ideas to help "thread this needle?"

6:15 Report Out on Foundational Questions

6:30 Adjourn

Appendix A:
Issues and Questions for Phase II

Teacher Preparation	Priority	Notes/Rationale/Explanation
How will institutions of higher education (IHEs) find opportunities to articulate their criteria for excellence in education?		
What is the commitment of higher education content faculty to make changes based on these recommendations?		
How will the recommendations and issues raised in this report interface with the New Hampshire Teacher Preparation process?		
How could the Department of Education support the professional development of those involved in preparing teachers, including IHE content faculty?		
How will the task force recommendations accommodate and promote the individuality of Pre-K-20 education partnerships?		
What models or experts in the field could support work to move these recommendations forward?		
How do we distribute resources, including funding commitments from all parties involved including the Department of Education?		

Induction with Mentoring	Priority	Notes/Rationale/Explanation
How can we ensure that induction-with-mentoring programs exist in New Hampshire districts given the New Hampshire statute that does not allow for unfunded mandates?		
What are the components of an effective awareness and outreach campaign to ensure high-quality, induction-with-mentoring programs from initial through sustained implementation?		
How will induction-with-mentoring programs provide unique support to Alternative IV and V candidates who may not have classroom experience and/or knowledge/skill regarding effective instruction?		
What competencies will be used to measure teacher effectiveness? How will we ensure that assessments of teacher effectiveness are valid, reliable, and free of bias?		
What multiple measures will be used ("soft" and "hard") to measure teacher effectiveness?		
What are the criteria and processes for selection of mentors and matching of mentors and new teachers?		
How will districts ensure that the mentor/ new teacher ratio is reasonable and allows time for coaching/observation cycles?		

Induction with Mentoring, cont.	Priority	Notes/Rationale/Explanation
How will new teachers be provided with consistent, ongoing opportunities to reflect on their practice?		
How is the professional development (content and structure) that will be provided to mentors and new teachers aligned with the 2011 Learning Forward (formerly National Staff Development Council) professional development standards?		
How will confidentiality be maintained between mentors and those who evaluate new teachers?		
What are the policies and practices that need to be in place to ensure that mentoring is non-evaluative?		
What terminology will be used to describe the role of those who support teachers in need of intensive assistance in order to make a clear distinction between that role and the role of mentors of new teachers?		
What are the criteria upon which induction-with-mentoring programs will be evaluated? What data sources will be used for program evaluation?		
What will ongoing induction-with-mentoring program evaluation look like? Who will conduct the program evaluation?		

Professional Development	Priority	Notes/Rationale/Explanation
What research exists that makes the connection between teacher professional development and student performance?		
What other professional development models might be used, based on the particular needs under consideration?		
To what extent do the recommendations "hang together" as a group?		
Do the recommendations have merit?		
Are the recommendations on target with respect to building an effective program of professional development?		
What's missing—what recommendations should we have made that are excluded?		
Are the recommendations practical and doable?		
Will the recommendations create difficult and burdensome practices for a school district?		

Professional Development, cont.	Priority	Notes/Rationale/Explanation
Will all school systems, regardless of size, circumstances, location, etc. be able to act on these recommendations?		
Are the recommendations appropriate for all types of school systems (e.g., large, small, urban, rural)?		
Will the recommendations contribute to a sustainable system of professional development for a school or district?		
Are the recommendations "administration free"? That is, are they independent of any single administrator or set of administrators in a school system?		
Will the recommendations meet teachers' needs regardless of their circumstances (e.g., beginning teacher, experienced teacher, etc.)?		
What are the implications of the recommendations for school, local, and state education leaders?		

Teacher Evaluation	Priority	Notes/Rationale/Explanation
Can student achievement receive high-priority consideration without being assigned a specific weight?		
The subcommittee did not make recommendations concerning non-tested subjects. What is the best approach for evaluating teachers in non-tested subjects and grades (e.g., should whole-school measures be used in individual teacher evaluation)?		
In the absence of sufficient measures that meet standards of reliability and validity, how can New Hampshire begin to implement high-quality systems of teacher evaluation?		
Given the recommendations, how do we build capacity that enables practitioners to carry out their work with fidelity?		
What is the optimal role for state and local agencies? What policies should be statewide and what policies should be locally determined?		
What human and financial resources will be required?		
What changes in school resources, structures, and roles will implementation require?		
What dissemination and education will be necessary to build public knowledge of and commitment to effective systems of teacher evaluation?		
How can career ladder opportunities for teachers be incorporated into a comprehensive teacher effectiveness system?		